## REMARKS

The Office Action dated September 1, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully noted.

In view of the foregoing amendments, and following representations, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Examiner Gilbert is thanked for the courtesies extended undersigned counsel and the applicant, Frank Koenig, during the personal interview of January 12, 2006.

During that January 12, 2006 interview, amended independent claim 1 was discussed, as well as dependent claim 5. The undersigned pointed out that the differences between the Stewart and Marmar references, and Applicant's amended claim 1.

Applicant described the invention, and the novel and unobvious features of the inventive methodology.

The undersigned pointed out that Example 3, as set forth on page 17 of the application, as filed, was neither anticipated nor obvious over any of the prior art of record.

Examiner Gilbert indicated that cancelled claims 1 and 5 differed from the steps of that Example 3, and that an Amendment

directed to the features of Example 3 would necessitate a new search and reconsideration and, hence, such an Amendment After Final would not be entered; yet the Examiner conceded that Example 3 appeared to define over the prior art of record, as evidenced by the Interview Summary dated January 12, 2006.

No agreement as to allowability of the claims was reached.

Examiner Gilbert is likewise thanked for the courtesies extended undersigned counsel during the telephone discussion of February 1, 2006.

During that February 1, 2006 discussion, new amended independent claim 19 was discussed to the extent that applicant would set forth the "erectile dysfunction medication including only one of a PDE-5 inhibitor and a vasodilator" to clearly show that in this set of claims applicant was claiming the administering of either a PDE-5 inhibitor or a vasodilator, but not both, and that this would be set forth at the end of each of the independent claims for the stylistic purpose of having a concisely written claim.

As to the Office Action in detail, please note the following.

To overcome the rejection of the claims in view of the prior art under 35 USC 102(b) and 103, Applicant has set forth new independent claim 19 directed to applicant's inventive features of applicant's Example 3 methodology, and the related text, as filed, and the rejection is submitted to be moot.

New independent claims 20 and 22 are directed to

Applicant's inventive methodologies of Examples 1 and 2,

respectively, as set forth on pages 14 and 15, respectively, in

the application, and the related text, as filed.

To reduce the number of issues, claims 1 - 14, and 16 - 18 have been cancelled.

New claims 20 - 23 have been set forth to provide Applicant with the varied scope of protection to which he is entitled.

In sum, the application is submitted to be in condition for allowance with claims 15, and 19-23.

Claims 19, 20, and 22 are in independent form.

Attached is a check in the amount of \$225.00 for a two-month extension of time (small entity). It is believed that no additional fee is due. However, should that determination be incorrect, Examiner Gilbert is hereby authorized to charge any

deficiencies to our Deposit Account No. 19-2105 and inform the undersigned in due course.

Should any outstanding formal matters or other issues remain, the Examiner Gilbert is hereby requested to telephone Terrence Brown at 703-684-5600 to resolve such.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

/ <del>`</del>{\_\_

Terrence L.B. Brown Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 32,685

SHLESINGER, ARKWRIGHT & GARVEY LLP 1420 King Street, Suite 600 Alexandria, Virginia 22314 (703) 684-5600 sb